

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/025,085 12/19/2001 Cher Huan Tan 2085-00600 4906 (IME-P002US) EXAMINER 23505 05/04/2004 7590 CONLEY ROSE, P.C. NGUYEN, THANH T P. O. BOX 3267 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267 2813

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
· Office Action Summary	10/025,085	TAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAU INC DATE of this communication	Thanh T. Nguyen	2813
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	n tne correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re t. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty briod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tatute, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		•
 1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ⊠ 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allocation accordance with the practice und 	This action is non-final. owance except for formal matte	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 5 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-2, 4-5 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	drawn from consideration. nd/or election requirement.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		
Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2813

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

The request filed on 9/30/03 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 10/025,085 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Election/Restrictions

Claims 6-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 3 and interview dated on 10/29/02.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2813

Claims 1-2, 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,323,123) in view of Ding (U.S. Patent No. 5,981,145).

Referring to figures 2A-2J, teaches in a via-first dual damascene process involving the use of a low-K dielectric material as an insulation layer on a wafer substrate during the fabrication of an integrated circuit, a method for photolithographic patterning comprising the steps of:

Covering the walls of an aperture (270, figure 2D-2E) etched into an insulation layer (230/235/240/250) on a wafer substrate (200) with a fill-in material (280) for isolating a portion of the insulation layer in the aperture from a photoresist layer (300) deposited thereafter, the fill-in material being chemically inert to the low-K dielectric material of the insulation layer (see col. 5, lines 22-30);

Depositing anti-reflective material (290, see figure 2F, col. 4, lines 49-58) onto the insulation layer for forming a sacrificial layer thereon, and being in contact with the fill-in material (280), wherein the fill-in material (spin on glass) and the anti-reflective material (preventing the glisten of surface) have different material properties (see col. 3, lines 8-25);

Depositing photoresist (300) on the sacrificial layer;

Exposing and developing the photoresist for providing a photoresist mask pattern for subsequent etching the insulation layer (see figure 2F, col. 4, lines 49-58); and

Removing the fill-in material from the aperture (see figure 2G, col. 4, lines 59-67).

Regarding to claim 2, the step of covering the walls of the aperture comprises the step of full filling the aperture (see figures 2E-2F).

Art Unit: 2813

Regarding to claim 4, the step of full filling the aperture comprises the step of full filling the aperture with a solvent based fill-in material (called spin-on-glass, see col. 4, lines 39-48).

Liu et al. teaches the method of forming the dual damascene structure by filling the aperture with solvent based fill-in material to protect the insulation layer from poisoning. However, Liu et al. does not teach the step of full filling the aperture with the solvent based fill-in material comprises the step of full filling the aperture with a water soluble fill-in material such as top antireflective coating and the specific thickness of the antireflective layer (sacrificial layer).

Ding et al. teaches in col. 2, lines 32-65, and col. 7, lines 11-24, using the antireflective coating with water-soluble fill-in material would provide a better image transfer, a low toxicity hazard and easy for handling/transportation in photolithographic patterning method.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the requisite art at the time of the invention was made would using the water soluble fill-in material as taught by Ding et al. in process of Liu et al. because the process would improving photolithographic pattern method by providing better image transfer and low toxicity hazard.

The thickness range of claim are considered to involve routine optimization while has been held to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. As noted in In re Aller, the selection of reaction parameters such as temperature and concentration would have been obvious:

"Normally, it is to be expected that a change in temperature, or in concentration, or in both, would be an unpatentable modification. Under some circumstances, however, changes such as these may impart patentability to a process if the particular ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely degree from the results of the prior art...such ranges are termed "critical ranges and the applicant has the burden of proving such criticality.... More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation."

Art Unit: 2813

In re Aller 105 USPQ233, 255 (CCPA 1955). See also In re Waite 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); In re Scherl 70 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1946); In re Irmscher 66 USPQ 314 (CCPA 1945); In re Norman 66 USPQ 308 (CCPA 1945); In re Swenson 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); In re Sola 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); In re Dreyfus 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the requisite art at the time the invention was made would have used any thickness range suitable to the method in process of Liu et al. in order to optimize the process.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1695, or by Email via address Thanh Nguyen@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:00AM to 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, can be reached on (571) 272-1702. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-1695.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956 (See MPEP 203.08.

Thanh Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Patent Examining Group 2800

Art Unit: 2813

Page 6